

NUMENOR 27

6 April 1981

NUMENOR is the business publication of the North American Diplomacy Federation. It is edited and published by the President, Rod Walker, at "Alcala", 1273 Crest Dr., Encinitas CA 92024. NUMENOR is sent to members of the NADF Steering Committee and, on occasion, to others who may be concerned with NADF business. Subscriptions are not encouraged, but copies will be provided at cost to those who specifically want them. Inquiries from non-members regarding NADF will not be answered unless accompanied by a self-addressed, stamped envelope. This is Pandemonium Publication #712.

THIS IS A SCHEDULE??

Well, what can I say? Another long delay and the usual bunch of reasons. Among other things, my electric typewriter was on the fritz for a full month (and in the Sears shop). The manual just doesn't produce as nice a copy and takes longer to work with, anyway. Things are now, however, much more caught-up than they have been in ages, so I hope that this will be the last big delay. I want to thank all of you for your patience. Aside from the usual expressions of worry from Fred, and a big "WAKE UP!" on the outside of an envelope from Mark, there have been no "where are you?" notes. Hm...does that indicate you're getting used to my peripatetic behavior or does it mean you don't care?

BIG REQUEST. The mass of material I get in for various purposes, often from the same people, is pretty large. Please make sure that everything which bears on NADF, and particularly material you want included in NUMENOR, is on a separate sheet from anything else, clearly labeled, and keyed to the Question (Proposal, &c.) that it pertains to.

COPIES

of this issue will go to Mike Mills, François Guerrier, Randolph Smyth, Herb Barents, John Daly, and Glenn Overby. And to all the members, of course.

ENCLOSURES

are included from Mark Berch and...I believe that's all. We'll see.

BIG PROBLEMS

Some of our members seem to be missing or withdrawing from the hobby. Without appointing successors. Specifically:

1. Miller Number Custodian. I am informed by Fred, Glenn, and others (I think) that Greg has not been assigning MNCs since before the end of last year. He also seems to be dropping out of his games. I had thought there was some sort of automatic replacement procedure for the MNC, but perhaps I'm mistaken. Anyway, some action is being taken. Prior to this current spate of inactivity, Greg had been working with me on a system whereby the MNC and the NAVBC would mutually guarantee their respective successions. We had not worked out all the details. However, inasmuch as Greg had expressed the wish that the NAVBC be responsible in the event he disappeared, I have written him asking him to inform me by the end of April whether he intended to continue as MNC. I have also sent a circular 'zine (ZIMIAMVIA 1) to all GMs known to me as variant GMs asking for details of current postal variants without MNCs, by the same deadline. Assuming I do not hear from Greg, the NAVB will then act to provide for continuity and the succession. I am informing the Steering Committee at this point in the event that anyone has (a) an objection to this way of resolving the problem or (b) any ideas or suggestions for things which NAVB might also be doing in that regard. Naturally we won't pursue the matter if Greg is going to continue.

2. PDRC Chairman. No PDRC work has been done in almost a year. And now Konrad has folded EGGNOG and is apparently inactive. I propose to proceed on this problem as follows: Where the resolution of something is self-evident, I hope the SC can proceed on a "no objection" basis. That is, I as President will take action proposed if there is no objection by the deadline set for the next NUMENOR. In my opinion, Konrad has "ceased to perform his function" as defined in Article II.6 of the Charter. This will mean that we regard the position of PDRC Chairman as vacant and Konrad as no longer a voting member of the SC. I will act on that basis if there is no objection. However: it seems to me that the importance of this position is relevant only if the various ratingsmasters feel the need for the Commission. I haven't heard any strenuous cries for it to continue business. Therefore, again if there is no objection, we can leave the position vacant until such time as the ratingsmasters perceive a need for it.

3. Hobby Archivist. There have been some inquiries here and there about the status of this project and its current custodian, Scott Marley. I'm physically not too far from Scott, and we visit each other perhaps twice every three months. Scott is continuing to maintain his files although there has been a bit of delay in picking up current 'zines from Jerry Jones. Scott is still cataloguing the pile of stuff he received from me and from Mark. His stock of current materials is not complete in the sense we meant that term in the days of Walt Buchanan, partly through the reluctance of some pubbers to send copies to the ORChive and partly through Scott's not strongly hustling to have complete input the way Walt did. Admittedly, there is no Archivezine, as HOOSIER ARCHIVES was or UTOPIA LTD. started out to be. These things give the ORChive a very low profile, one virtually indistinguishable from inactivity. Scott is aware of this problem and is now at work on an Archive project, a hobby history more detailed than the usual short articles, the first "volume" to cover the years 1962-1965. While the Archivist has not at this point ceased to perform his function, exactly, I'm sure he would welcome your suggestions for things which could be done to make the ORChive more useful and still fit in with the rather crowded personal schedules we all seem to develop sooner or later.

NEW MEMBERS

By virtue of their positions, Herb Barents (Chairman, Committee of Three) and John Daly (USOS) should be members of the Steering Committee. I am enclosing ratification forms with this issue (and hopefully also copies of back issues, including the Charter), so that they should be voting members by next issue. Also, as you will see, Randolph Smyth (NADF Ombudsman) is now a member. Later this issue I will print a complete membership list with current addresses.

BALLOT RESULTS

Ballot results are reported in the same format as last issue. New initials: J, Jones; L, Linsey; S, Smyth.

<u>Proposal</u>	Ba	Be	D	J	L	P	S	W	<u>Result</u>
80.1	K	K	K	-	K	K	P	K	Defeated.
80.9	K	K	P	-	K	D	P	P	K=3, D+P=5; continued for debate.
80.10	K	P	P	-	P	D	P	P	Passed (Article IX.7 & I.5.b).
80.11	K	K	K	-	K	D	P	P	Defeated.
80.12	K	K	P	-	K	D	P	P	K=4, D+P=5; continued for debate.

Please note that I am continuing to count abstentions as "debate". Costikyan, Kendter, and Marley did not vote. The CDO Ombudsman (François Guerrier currently) has been added to the Charter as eligible to membership and François will be a voting member when he ratifies the Charter.

PENDING QUESTIONS

Q80.3, Hobby Census. Glenn Overby (who is doing the project at this time for 1981): I can't see any reason to combine the Census and the Zine Directory. I think that more work goes into that ZD than is apparent at first glance--especially given the amount of fluctuation inherent in any current 'zine listing. Piling the "donkey work" of the Census on top of the ZD is, as Lew pointed out, a good way to get volunteers for neither job instead of one or the other. In my opinion...Mike Mills' job belongs on the SC. I've also reviewed the Charter's description of the Census job--and I feel there's too much piled up there. However, I don't think there's enough specific duties at this time to warrant a separate Director of Polls and Surveys. I therefore would propose the following new definition for the post of Director, Hobby Census: (1) Compiles hobby-wide name/address census or equivalent listings. (2) Conducts polls and surveys as directed by the SC under provision VII.3 of this Charter. (3) Publishes the end products of 1 and 2 above in appropriate formats. If the NADF ever has to deal with substantially larger numbers of polls and surveys, then another job can be created. I believe that the new formulation of the Census position above is less sweeping than the original, yet still manageable by one person.

Mike Mills (ZINE DIRECTORY): I must agree with your statements concerning the Zine Directory and the Census. While the two are collections of information, since Glenn Overby wants to do a Census the two should be separated by the NADF. Glenn will have a lot of work cut out for himself collecting, ordering, and typing up a US Hobby Census. I say US, since the CDO already keeps a Canadian census. I would suggest in this regard that Glenn ask François permission to use the CDO census in the NADF Census.

Fred Davis: (I propose that we) add NADF Census Director as a member of NADF. (Specifically, Glenn Overby, but I presume that it's not necessary to state this by name. I'd appreciate it if his name was mentioned somewhere in the preface to the Proposal, however.) ((But see Article IX.2, which already provides this; we're discussing activating it.))

Mark Berch: See enclosure.

Note: See also Q80.13. I think we can go to the proposal stage with this one.

Q80.7, Fund-raising. Mark Berch: See enclosure.

Fred Davis: Instead of dues, perhaps each member of the NADF "Council" could be requested to submit a small sum on a semi-annual basis to cover the costs of printing NUMENOR, and other expenses for the President and Treasurer, such as postage. I'll enclose my check for \$2.00 to get the ball rolling. ((Thanks, Fred; of course, I've already spent it on this issue.))

Rod Walker: We really have two things being talked about under this heading. One, how are the administrative expenses of NADF to be defrayed? Effectively, these amount to the production and mailing of NUMENOR. That is less pressing, since I am still willing to underwrite them and continue to ask the members for voluntary donations to help. Of course, that's not completely fair, since some of you have contributed and others haven't. Perhaps some set, predetermined amount would be best. Hmmm.... Two, and more important, how are we to raise money to help Custodians who need it? We still seem to be ineffectually spinning our wheels on that one. What we need, I believe, are concrete ideas to get money in the till. And guidelines for distributing it. Mark's idea of a predetermined conduit has not been opposed by anyone that I'm aware of, so that's probably the way we will ultimately go. Now, how do we get some cash in that conduit? And who will be the preset beneficiaries?? SPEAKING OF WHICH: I have been told that Bill Young had not (as of late last year) made distribution of the IDA Treasury as provided by the last actions of that organization's now-defunct Council. The reason is that the action was reported to him differently by me and by Robert Sacks. I have written Bill in an effort to straighten that out and get the cash to the

people for whom it was intended. No reply, and no indication that he responded to anyone else. Bruce? Lee? John? Did you get any money from Bill? Please let me know one way or the other. This matter should be resolved as quickly as possible.

Q80.8. Annual Hobby Handbook. Mark Berch: See enclosure.

Rod Walker: As previously indicated, Scott is concentrating on a comprehensive history of the hobby from the sources. That seems to take the handbook idea back into limbo. Mark, what is your proposal?

Q80.9. NADF Genzine. Mark Berch: See enclosure.

Fred Davis: I don't see us publishing a NADF Genzine at this time. Maybe later, if someone rises up and volunteers to do so. We can always use the pages of DIPLOMACY WORLD to contact the general hobby.

Lew Pulsipher: There aren't enough articles for a genzine, nor enough interest, and if we put too much effort into a zine it will kill NADF as surely as it has killed many clubs in the past. A news-zine would be useful, small and issued monthly or more often; but no article zine, please.

Rod Walker: I think there is a thundering lack of enthusiasm for this idea, and I can see why. One, we have no volunteer, much less someone of such outstanding editorial talent as to guarantee success. (I'd volunteer, but....) Two, we would probably tend to undercut DW, perhaps. That would not be a good thing. If there is no objection, let's table this one until such time as some sterling opportunity presents itself. OK?

Q80.13. 'Zine Directory. Mark Berch: See enclosure.

See also: Q80.3.

This one, too, I believe can go to Proposal.

Q80.17. Ombudsman's Term of Office. Fred Davis: The NADF Ombudsman should hold his office for a term of three years. I prefer this to an indefinite term. Everything ought to have a finite ending.

Well, here we have a proposal. See that section.

NEW QUESTIONS

Q81.1. PDRC. Please see page 2, item 2. If there is any objection to my proposed action, please note it under this Q heading. Any discussion of restarting PDRC under here, also.

Q81.2. MNC Succession. Please see page 1, item 1. Comments on that one under this Q heading, please. (That's stupid; I referred them. Oh, well, what can I say?....)

Q81.3. Hobby Archivist. Please see page 2, item 3. Comments on that item under this Q heading, please.

BACK TO PENDING QUESTIONS

Q80.18. Code of Ethics. Almost forgot. Fred Davis: I propose that NADF drop the Code of Ethics from its Charter and table this matter until the Ombudsman Council completes its work on a revised continent-wide Code.

François Cuerrier: See enclosure. Found another one, by gum! Please send comments and suggestions to François on the Canadian CoE or any other CoE question(s).

But, at the same time, I think a proposal is in order. Q.v.

AND BACK TO NEW QUESTIONS

Q81.4. Deadlines. Randolph, Mark, and François are all strongly agreed that mail service between Canada and the U.S. is terrible. They feel that some of the shorter deadlines specified in the Charter may not work well for members who live in Canada (of which we now have one, maybe two). I am

not going to argue the point, although I feel the deadlines are reasonable notwithstanding. Certainly there should never be any feeling that some awful thing can be railroaded through NADF. I would like some discussion on this, please. If there is general agreement the shorter deadlines should be made longer, I will propose doing so on a "no-exception" basis as sort of administrative amendments to our Charter.

Q81.5. Associate Ombudsman. The Charter provides for one of these. I would like to ask for nominations. I would particularly like to know whom Randolph would like to second him at his post. Nominating a person already a member of this Committee would not be amiss, I believe.

PENDING PROPOSALS

P80.9 & .12. CDO CoOrdinator & Orphans Officer: François Guerrier:
See enclosure.

Lew Pulsipher: I voted debate for all Canadian members because of the contradictory statements from Rod and François about mail transit times between the US and Canada. If François is correct, then we may as well forget our efforts to "combine" Canada and the US in NADF. My three years in Britain showed that when it takes over a week for a letter to move to another country, that country will be ignored. The British don't give a damn what's happening in America or Europe, yet transit times are about 7 days, and mail to Europe costs little more than British domestic mail. If US-Canada takes 7-10 or even 15 days, people just won't bother with the other side of the border. If it takes no longer than US domestic mail, we have a good chance to cooperate. In other words, my decision will be based entirely on the practical matter governing international relations in this hobby, period.

Randolph Smyth: I'm voting to include all the CDO officers, and anyone else under the sun, as members, not because they necessarily perform jobs of the same magnitude as their U.S. counterparts, but simply because I don't see the merit of blocking anyone's input into the NADF. For your information, I'm not only the Coordinator but (again, regretfully) the Orphans Officer until I can find a replacement; so in practice, few voting members will be added right away even if all proposals are passed. ** I don't entirely agree that the US-Canada split is "regrettable"--as alluded to in NUMENOR, parallel systems may provide a useful backup if one collapses. With CDO and the Canadian hobby as a whole on a "down" cycle at the moment (only 4 reliable zines running regular Diplomacy games, and not much interest exhibited in CDO operations), and the NADF departments just getting started in a few cases, a division of effort may be the best answer, even if there is some duplication. The important thing, as you say, is that the work is done. I don't like to operate inefficiently, either, though, so I don't anticipate any problems between us. ** I'd be happy to act as a Charter interpreter when necessary--though you realize that I have no "legal" qualifications and in fact not much interest in the legalities of the matter. I view my role more as a mediator between you and anyone who challenges your rulings, rather than an expert of any kind. My "suitability" as Ombudsman perhaps arises from a long history of never offending anyone enough to make a permanent enemy, rather than any shining brilliance at making the "right" decision in a particular case.

Rod Walker: Lew, I think you will find that the English don't give a damn about Europe in spite of mail transit, rather than because of it. Our relations with Canada are different. Despite the long (or short) mail times, US players are found in Canadian 'zines and vice-versa. We do care about our friends across the border and they (I hope) care about us. In any event, I feel every effort should be made to cooperate, because we will all benefit. If changing a few short deadlines in the Charter to longer ones will make everyone happy, let's do it. These deadlines are to prevent over-hasty action, anyway. And we can't have really effective cooperation

without having a common meeting ground where the project managers on both sides of the border can come together. If NADF were to (effectively) become USDF, then I suppose there would eventually be a North American Something-or-other which would coordinate CDO and USDF activities. But even now many projects are continent-wide (BNC & MNC, for instance). As a practical matter, I conceive that there has to be a limit to how many projects can split at the border, but observing the status quo seems the best approach for now. I hope we can revive the proposal to extend membership to the CDO Novice Director and at least have the four who have thus far been named on the S.C.

NEW PROPOSALS

81.1. Hobby Census. Implement Article IX.2 of the Charter.

81.2. Hobby Census Job Description. Amend Article IX.2 to conform to the job description given by Glenn Overby on p. 3 of this issue.

81.3. Hobby Census Taker. Appoint Glenn Overby as Custodian of the Hobby Census, with the proviso that if he is unable to continue with his duties he will appoint his own successor, if possible.

81.4. 'Zine Directory. Add "Hobby 'Zine Directory" to Article II.2 and Appendix B. Text of Appendix B entry to be: "Editor, Hobby ZINE DIRECTORY. Compiles listings of active hobby 'zines, indicating as much relevant information as is available. Causes listings to be updated and printed on a periodic basis, and makes copies available for purchase on a hobby-wide basis. Makes all efforts to insure completeness and accuracy of information. Selects own successor." ((Current Custodian is Mike Mills.))

81.5 NADF Ombudsman. Amend Article III.3 to delete the 2nd sentence, beginning, "His term of office...". Substitute new sentence: "His term of office will be for three (3) years."

81.6. NADF Associate Ombudsman. Amend Article III.3 to delete last phrase, "the GM/P members will define his duties". Substitute new last sentence: "The Associate Ombudsman will assist the NADF Ombudsman where necessary and when requested. See also Article III.5. The Associate Ombudsman will serve as NADF Ombudsman pro tempore whenever the current Ombudsman cannot fulfill his duties and prior to the election of a new Ombudsman. The Associate Ombudsman's term of office will be for three (3) years; however, the NADF Ombudsman may request the Steering Committee to elect a new Associate at any time and the Steering Committee may, by majority vote, agree to hold a new election."

81.7. Code of Ethics. Amend Article IX.8 to read: "Appendix A. The text of Appendix A is deferred (NADF Code of Ethics). The NADF Code of Ethics must be written or adopted by the Steering Committee not later than 31 December 1982. The Steering Committee may appoint a special commission to write the text. Adoption of the text would be by majority vote."

81.8. Code of Ethics Text. The Steering Committee appoints the Ombudsman's Council headed by François Cuerrier as a special commission to write the text of the NADF Code of Ethics. The commission is requested to report its proposed text to the Steering Committee not later than 1 May 1982.

81.9. CDO Novice Director. The Steering Committee reconsiders its vote on P80.11 and now adopts that proposal.

DEADLINES: See the enclosed ballot. I plan to be away all during the 2nd week of May and want to have everything pending cleared up before I leave (since I will have a pile of mail to take care of when I get back). A great deal depends on when I get EREHWON back from the printer, since I will then have to address and mail 100++ copies. Yucky-poo. Anyway, if we get it back

I have studied the NADF Charter for some time now, and would like to offer a few comments. Forgive me for being so tardy in offering comments on a subject that dates back to Nimnecor 22, but it could not be helped.

First off, allow me to congratulate you all for an amazingly well-worded document. In spite of a few parts where more work may be needed, the document appears to be complete. My comments:

(1) Generally speaking, I do wish that the Charter would allow for longer deadlines for some responses from the membership on some matters. As things stand, the Charter seems to limit some people--especially Canadians--rather dramatically, which I believe is sad. Thus, under VIII(1).d, the Charter says, "Any three members of the SC may request that a question be referred from the WG to the SC. This request may be made any time from the time the proposal is made in the WG to 15 days after the minutes announcing the WG vote on the question is mailed." If I understand this correctly, the SC members, will, in general, have only 15 days to make the said request. I really wonder how you expect the future 22 Canadian SC members to take advantage of this provision, as one-way mail from the US to Canada and vice-versa takes at least 7-10 days (over 15 days in the case of US West Coast to Canada) travel time.... IV(1) appears to be similarly (though to a lesser extent) restrictive for Canadians. This, of course, hasn't been a major problem until now, but as you got Canadians to sit on the SC, it might become a very real problem. Perhaps you should consider extending these two particular deadlines by as much as 50%.

(2) My second beef concerns III (GM/P Members). I myself do not care much for the restrictions the Charter has imposed on this wing of the Federation, and do not care much for the apparent hierarchy between SC and GM/P. I understand that the latter is merely an auxiliary, but it would seem to me that the rules governing the wing should be best left up to their actual members. This would not necessarily alter the importance or structure of the SC, and yet respect a few of the principles of federalism. I believe that NADF could be better off with each wing having a greater degree of autonomy.

Further, I don't believe it would be a good idea to have this wing (GM/P) elect the Ombudsman and draft a Code of Ethics alone. I believe that part of an ombudsman's function is to protect the players in disputes; the ombudsman could be handicapped if he is answerable before the GMs. (That is: the votes being among the GMs, it will be only logical for the ombudsman to try and please the GMs, possibly to the players' detriment. This, methinks, is the wrong result....) Further, having the GMs draft the Code of Ethics only confirms their "power" vis-à-vis players--i.e. they get to decide what is ethical and what is not, which is the essence of power in this hobby, at least in part. I feel that other hobby members should have some say. On the other hand, I might have missed something that I am not aware of in III, which might render the above moot.

While I'm on the topic of a Code of Ethics: Rod proposed that the CDO Code of Ethics be adopted as the NADF Code of Ethics, but his proposal was apparently defeated. Since I am the responsible officer for the Code within CDO, I would be most appreciative if those who voted "no" could offer their arguments, beefs, and dislikes for the CDO Code of Ethics, and if possible, offer alternative solutions, in a personal letter to me. My address is listed above. I will be only too happy to bring your points before the Ombudsman's Advisory Committee in a possible future revision of the Code's recommendations.

That is it regarding the Charter itself. Perhaps the III. definition of ombudsman (and the procedures for electing him) have changed since N 22. If so, I was not aware of it, and kindly make allowances. Also, I am well aware that Mark would prefer to hold off a bit on the GM/P outfit; however, I disagree, as I feel that NADF can carry off discussions on both this "outfit" and "the more important things" simultaneously, with almost no problem. In any case, if the discussion on the GM/P wing is delayed, then perhaps this will give you more time for reflection on the above.

Moving on. I have a couple of comments regarding Nimnecor 25. Q80.7 & Q80.8. In my opinion, Mark's proposals are the most valuable and advantageous for the time being. Particularly, I like his idea of the "conduit", as opposed to the "giant pot", strategy regarding fundraising. His notions imply, in a way, a more voluntary financial participation on the part of the general public (i.e. people will finance what they want to finance, and little else; they are sure their money will be spent on projects they

care about.) There's only one potential danger: the hobbyists, in general, are egocentric, and have the attitude, "If I don't like it, then the hobby doesn't need it." Thus, someone who might have financed or contributed to NADF might actually refrain from doing so because he doesn't like a particular project supported by NADF. But, as I see it, this is a very minor problem.

I have a question on the "Yearbook" business. Just how different would a Yearbook be from a Handbook? What else can be included, but "just another collection of articles"? Humour? That's nothing new, as the 1977 Diplomacy Handbook (Costikyan) relied rather heavily on just that. Variants? Many Handbooks covered the topic in part. I don't see how a Yearbook could differ greatly from a Handbook. But I'm obviously missing something, so I would appreciate someone telling me what would be so different.

As to the ballot: I differ with Mark's position. I favour a broader solution, whereby 9, 10, 11, and 12 would each get a seat. I don't see why the CDO Orphans Officer should be excluded just because Canadian folds go very cleanly. It might just be that he does his job well... Thus, I agree with Rod's arguments...

FRANÇOIS GUERRIER

COMMENTS FOR NUMINOR #27 MARK L BECHT

I think it is very important that we keep some priorities in order. There is a strong temptation to tackle ten things all at once, with the result that a lot of things may get half done. The important things are 1) those items essential to our own internal operations and 2) things that we are best qualified or placed to do. Included in 1) are finalizing our membership and setting in place a dues mechanism. Included in 2) are picking a US ombudsman (already done) and perhaps organizing a hobby Yearbook. By contrast, the Code of Ethics business can be put off. This might better come from perhaps the N.A. Ombudsman's commission, or perhaps Jerry Jone's new Player Association or maybe the GM/P outfit. Another item would be GM/P itself. Frankly, though such a group would be useful, there is no compelling need for it right now. Pubbers are not clamoring for it. Let's wait till they are. With so many new organizations coming into focus, let's not overburden things.

Q80.3 Hobby Census Well, I can see this as a separate project with a separate head, though ideally it would be published in tandem with the Zine Directory. The mechanics would be simple. Start with the DW mailing list and then work in as many Zine sublists as possible into the sublist. I estimate 12-20 sides in total, but I wonder how much demand there will be for the final project. It will be a lot of work in a short period of time. The question of Overby's joining the NADF SC should be deferred until he actually puts out an issue of the census. I see no value in including Non-northamericans, since there is little need for that, but US and Canada are basically one hobby, and thus there should be one census if at all possible.

Q80.7 Dues Unless there are serious objections, I will take the comments in #27 into consideration and present in #28 a specific proposal for an up-or-down vote. I want to emphasize that the dues moneys are for funding projects. Numinor is our own medium and should be supported from our own pockets. We don't ~~want~~ want people to think that their dues are going to fund a debating medium.

Q80.8 Hobby Annual Yearbook I'll wait for further discussion, and then present a comprehensive idea for a Yearbook (a look at the previous year). This will present the type of material not ordinarily ~~is~~ available, so that it does not compete.

Q80.9 Genzine Since Rod is willing to let NADF sustaining members sub to Numinor, I see no need for a separate genzine to draw dues-payers. There are plenty of other genzines and gamezines which will print articles, and any new genzine will just tend to weaken the others, as it will draw off material from dippy zines. Organization type stuff can go into Numinor.

Q80.13 Zine Directory With the publication of his second, I think he qualifies.

Canadian Mail Service from the US is as lousy as Guerrier describes. I have never gotten things in less than 5 days, and most in in the 6-9 day period.